



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME CORRECTIONS TO THE TEXTS OF CYLINDERS A AND
B OF THE ESARHADDON INSCRIPTIONS AS PUB-
LISHED IN I R., 45-47, AND III R., 15, 16.

BY ROBERT F. HARPER, PH. D.,
New Haven, Conn.

The inscriptions of Esarhaddon were first published in Layard's *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments*, 1851. Cylinder A is given on pages 20-29 under the title "On an Hexagonal Cylinder," and B on pages 54-58 under the title "On lower half of an Hexagonal Object of Baked Clay." The text of this edition is of no value for critical study. It is, however, as good as could have been expected at that time. The text of A appeared later in I R., 45-47. This edition is vastly superior to that of Layard, and can, in general, be depended on. Cylinder B appeared again in III R., 15, 16, edited by George Smith. This edition is not as trustworthy as that of A in I R., on account of the extremely bad condition of the original of B. The texts of A and portions of B, with transliteration and translation, were published for the last time by Ernest A. Budge, in his *History of Esarhaddon*, London, 1880. Budge's edition of these texts is untrustworthy. As it appeared as late as 1880, and "after a careful (?) collation of all the principal texts," it has been received by many as an authority. One need only compare it with the originals to see that this is not the case. Cf. Delitzsch's review in the *Literarisches Centralblatt*, May 21, 1881. Paul Haupt, on the other hand (*vid.* HEBRAICA, I., p. 229), says: "Since Mr. Budge's laborious work has been censured beyond measure, I take pleasure in being able to state that I consider *The History of Esarhaddon* fully as good as George Smith's *History of Assurbanipal* and the *History of Sennacherib* by the same scholar." Even if this were true, one must take into consideration that Smith's *Assurbanipal* was published in 1871, and Budge's *Esarhaddon* in 1880. Haupt's comparison, however, is unjust to Smith and does little credit to Budge's book.



In the summer of 1885, while studying in the British Museum, I collated A and B, and copied C.¹ This collation forms the basis of the corrections which I have to offer to the texts as published by Rawlinson, Smith, and Budge.








In conclusion, I wish to express my indebtedness to Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, of the British Museum, both for his kindness in helping me while at work in the Museum, and especially for the collations of several difficult passages contained in a letter of Jan. 24, '87. I am also under very many obligations to my highly honored teacher, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, for the assistance which he has rendered me.



¹ The text of Cylinder C (heretofore unpublished), as copied by me from the original in the British Museum, will be printed from photo-engraved plates in the July number of HEBRAICA.

the two characters us-ri at the end I see ~~no~~ perhaps traces
of 𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡 (ana naḥal). Compare with this, Cyl. C. II, 7 where I read
~~𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡 𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡~~ 𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡. Cf. also K. 3086, K. 3082, S. 2027. As a result of these
comparisons, I am inclined to read: 𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡 ina ite] naḥal ~~maḥ~~
Muṣri, or, perhaps [𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡] ~~𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡 𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡 𐎢𐎠𐎧𐎡~~. "Pinches!!"

A. II. 1. This line is entirely broken away on the orig. I could not distinguish any signs whatever. Pinches (letter of Jan. 24/82) writes: Here I can only see ~~the~~ with a few dents where 2 or 3 characters have been. Iākēsu has probably been taken from a duplicate fragt. "Cf. for Iākēsu Cyl. C. II, 8, ~~the~~ 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹.

A. II 3. The text in I. R. 45, II, 3, viz. , etc. (cf. also, Norris, Dict. 229, 305) is correct. Budge's reading (HE)  is entirely wrong. Vid. Haupt's Wäkeb-ben-Nagael, Hebraica, I., 229.

A. II. 4. Insert after  the sign , which can be seen very plainly on the orig. After the  some other sign was written and afterwards erased by the scribe. It looks as if the scribe had first written   and, afterwards, scratched off all but the . Budge naturally passes the line without comment. A. II. 10. () (so Rawlinson, Layard and Budge) is not on any of the three cylinders.

A. II., 10. Read ki--di instead of ki--di.

A. II, 17. Read ~~𐎢~~ instead of ~~𐎢~~. The latter really stands on the orig. but must be regarded as a mistake of the scribe himself. Cyl. B. III, 9 and Cyl. C. II, 20 both have ~~𐎢~~. Budge (H.E.) reads ~~𐎢~~ without comment, as if it were on the original.

A.II.23. The text in I.R. is correct. Budge attempts to correct the published text by reading asibu-⁹7.

A. II, 44. Read ka-mu-⁸.

B. III, 23. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš; B. III, 24. Read i-du-~~c~~.

B. IV, 1. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš; B. IV, 2. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš; B. IV, 3. Omit the ra in Smith's restoration of *matu* Pa-tu-uš-ar-na.

B. IV, 3. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (so Pinches also).

B. IV, 3. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (so Pinches also).

B. IV, 3. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (so Pinches also).

B. IV, 11. Read su-~~ra~~-mê instead of su-~~ra~~-mê.

B. IV, 12. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (so Hilprecht also in Z.K. II. 193. 2)

Cf. also 7 $\frac{80}{65}$ -19.

B. IV, 18. Read šal-ta-niš-~~c~~.



B. IV, 19. Lines 19-22 are very badly broken and hence most difficult to decipher. In line 19 I read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš-pi-a-tê, while Delitzsch (P.D. 306) and Schrader (K.G.F. 104) read Na^o pi-a-tê. Pinches also reads ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš on both B and 7 $\frac{80}{65}$ -19.

B. IV, 20. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (so Pinches also). Cf. 7 $\frac{80}{65}$ -19. Delitzsch writes: "so hatte ich auch auf Cyl. B. gelesen."

B. IV, 21. Read ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (so Pinches also). Budge's edition (H.E.) of this part of the text is practically a reprint of III. R. and hence quite worthless from a critical standpoint.

B. IV, 24. Pinches (letter of Jan. 24/87) writes: "I read the first half of this line ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš (or ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš) ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš. For the 3rd character see Z. K. F. vol. I., p. 349. ("I scattered about the corpses of their warriors like corn". To determine the kind of corn is the difficulty)." III. R. has kima ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš. Budge (H.E.) reads: ki-ma (FF) ~~ra~~-~~nu~~-uš. This reading — as, indeed, the great majority of Budge's readings of difficult passages — is altogether worthless.

B. I., 1-5. The latter half of these lines is to be restored from Cyls. R. and C.

B.V, 7. The first part of this line is broken. Pinches (letter of Jan. 24th/1877) reads:  (or ) 